

FILED UNDER SEAL

BATHAE DUNNE LLP
Yavar Bathae (CA 282388)
yavar@bathaeedunne.com
Andrew C. Wolinsky (CA 345965)
awolinsky@bathaeedunne.com
445 Park Avenue, 9th Floor
New York, NY 10022
Tel.: (332) 322-8835

Brian J. Dunne (CA 275689)
bdunne@bathaeedunne.com
Edward M. Grauman (*pro hac vice*)
egrauman@bathaeedunne.com
901 South MoPac Expressway
Barton Oaks Plaza I, Suite 300
Austin, TX 78746
Tel.: (213) 462-2772

(Additional counsel on signature page)

*Interim Co-Lead Counsel for the
Advertiser Classes*

SCOTT+SCOTT ATTORNEYS AT LAW LLP
Amanda F. Lawrence (*pro hac vice*)
alawrence@scott-scott.com
Patrick J. McGahan (*pro hac vice*)
pmcgahan@scott-scott.com
Michael P. Srodoski (*pro hac vice*)
msrodoski@scott-scott.com
156 South Main Street, P.O. Box 192
Colchester, CT 06415
Tel.: (860) 537-5537

Patrick J. Coughlin (CA 111070)
pcoughlin@scott-scott.com
Carmen A. Medici
cmedici@scott-scott.com
Hal D. Cunningham (CA 243048)
hcunningham@scott-scott.com
Daniel J. Brockwell (CA 335983)
dbrockwell@scott-scott.com
600 W. Broadway, Suite 3300
San Diego, CA 92101
Tel.: (619) 233-4565

(Additional counsel on signature page)

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION**

MAXIMILIAN KLEIN, et al., on behalf of
themselves and all others similarly situated,

Plaintiffs,

v.

META PLATFORMS, INC.,

Defendant.

Case No. 3:20-cv-08570-JD

Hon. James Donato

**ADVERTISER PLAINTIFFS' NOTICE OF
MOTION AND MOTION TO EXCLUDE
THE EXPERT REPORT AND
TESTIMONY OF DR. CATHERINE
TUCKER**

Hearing Date: December 14, 2023

Hearing Time: 10:00 a.m.

Courtroom 11, 19th Floor

FILED UNDER SEAL

NOTICE OF MOTION AND MOTION FOR CLASS CERTIFICATION

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that on December 14, 2023, at 10:00 a.m., before the Honorable James Donato, of the United States District Court for the Northern District of California, San Francisco Division, 450 Golden Gate Avenue, San Francisco, California, Courtroom 11, 19th Floor, Advertiser Plaintiffs Affilious, Inc., Jessyca Frederick, Mark Berney, 406 Property Services, PLLC, Mark Young, and Katherine Looper, on behalf of themselves and all others similarly situated, will and now do move the Court for an order excluding the Advertiser Class Rebuttal Report and related testimony of Dr. Catherine Tucker.

This motion is based upon this Notice of Motion, the accompanying Memorandum of Points and Authorities, all filed supporting declarations and exhibits, the records, pleadings, and other documents on file in this consolidated action, and any argument that may be presented at or before the hearing on this Motion.

FILED UNDER SEAL

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PRELIMINARY STATEMENT	1
BACKGROUND	1
ARGUMENT	4
I. Dr. Tucker’s opinions regarding Facebook’s sale of Social Advertising during the Class Period should be excluded	4
II. Dr. Tucker’s opinions regarding the impact of Facebook’s alleged conduct should be excluded because they do not analyze the presence or absence of monopoly	8
III. Dr. Tucker’s opinions regarding alleged [REDACTED] from Facebook’s anticompetitive conduct should be excluded	10
CONCLUSION.....	13

FILED UNDER SEAL

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

<i>Gen. Elec. Co. v. Joiner</i> , 522 U.S. 136 (1997).....	13
<i>Stiner v. Brookdale Senior Living, Inc.</i> , 2023 WL 2722294 (N.D. Cal. Mar. 20, 2023).....	4

Rules

FED. R. EVID. 702	4
-------------------------	---

FILED UNDER SEAL**PRELIMINARY STATEMENT**

On August 4, 2023, Defendant Meta Platforms, Inc. (“Facebook”) served on Advertiser Plaintiffs an expert report by Dr. Catherine Tucker. Dr. Tucker’s report—one of two expert reports she signed that day in this case—purported to rebut opinions from two of Advertisers’ experts, Dr. Michael Williams and Professor Joshua Gans. Dr. Tucker’s Advertiser report offered opinions about Facebook’s sale of Social Advertising during the Class Period, about [REDACTED] due to the company’s anticompetitive conduct, and about supposed variations in injury and damages to Facebook advertisers if the company’s anticompetitive conduct were proved. Upon examination, Dr. Tucker’s opinions on these topics are junk science. They ignore the record, including the actual opinions Dr. Tucker purports to rebut; they ignore basic economics, including the impact of monopoly on product innovation, efficiency passthrough, and price inflation; and they pertain to evidentiary issues (*e.g.*, [REDACTED]) about which Dr. Tucker admitted at deposition she had no personal knowledge or expertise.

Collectively, Dr. Tucker’s unreliable opinions comprise the entire substance of her class certification expert report and testimony. As a result, Advertiser Plaintiffs respectively move to exclude Dr. Tucker’s report and testimony in its entirety at this class certification stage.

BACKGROUND¹

On July 7, 2023, Advertiser Plaintiffs served four expert reports, including the Expert Report of Michael A. Williams, Ph.D.,² and the Expert Report of Joshua S. Gans.³ The Williams Report disclosed opinions pertaining to the relevant antitrust market for Advertiser Plaintiffs’ case—the United States Social Advertising Market;⁴ Facebook’s monopoly power in that market;⁵ classwide

¹ All exhibits are attached to the Declaration of Brian J. Dunne (“Dunne Dec.”).

² Ex. 1 (“Williams Rpt.”).

³ Ex. 2 (“Gans Rpt.”).

⁴ Williams Rpt. ¶¶ 16-215.

⁵ *Id.* ¶¶ 216-322.

FILED UNDER SEAL

1 antitrust impact;⁶ and classwide damages.⁷ The Gans Report analyzed the impact of Facebook’s
2 allegedly anticompetitive conduct on the Social Advertising market,⁸ evaluating five categories of
3 conduct and opining that the conduct “had impacts that can be demonstrated on a classwide basis.”⁹

4 Dr. Williams defined the Social Advertising market by conducting a full *Brown Shoe*
5 analysis;¹⁰ applying the Horizontal Merger Guidelines methodology, including by conducting a
6 SSNIP test;¹¹ and evaluating more than thirty distinct sources, including competition authorities,
7 industry analysts, and market participants to explain “[w]hat is social advertising,” “[w]hat is not
8 social advertising,” and to evaluate whether and to what extent Facebook’s advertising products
9 during the Class Period qualified as Social Advertising.¹² Dr. Williams explained that “[s]ocial
10 advertising is advertising that can be targeted based on social data contained in a ‘social graph’” at
11 the outset of his lengthy market definition analysis.¹³ Professor Gans understood the Social
12 Advertising market to “comprise[] suppliers of ad placement services with access to a social graph
13 that establishes direct connections between users,” which defines a “specific data advantage” for
14 providers,¹⁴ but understood that “[t]he analysis of the relevant market definition and Facebook’s
15 position in it will . . . be provided in other reports.”¹⁵

16 The Williams Report showed Facebook’s monopoly power in the Social Advertising market
17 using direct and indirect evidence, including by analyzing Facebook’s economic profit rate, return on

18
19 ⁶ *Id.* ¶¶ 323-54.

20 ⁷ *Id.* ¶¶ 355-64.

21 ⁸ Gans Rpt. ¶¶ 49-109.

22 ⁹ *Id.* ¶ 49.

23 ¹⁰ Williams Rpt. ¶¶ 144-211.

24 ¹¹ *Id.* ¶¶ 134-43.

25 ¹² *Id.* ¶¶ 16-126.

26 ¹³ *Id.* ¶ 19.

27 ¹⁴ Gans Rpt. ¶ 7, *see also id.* ¶ 13.

28 ¹⁵ *Id.* ¶ 7.

FILED UNDER SEAL

capital employed, operating margins, and advertising prices during the Class Period.¹⁶ Dr. Williams analyzed classwide antitrust injury and damages by performing a yardstick analysis using economic profit rates from comparable firms¹⁷—identified using six stated criteria¹⁸—to construct a but-for competitive world, and measuring Facebook’s actual advertising revenues during the Class Period against it.¹⁹

On August 4, Facebook served the Advertiser Class Rebuttal Report of Catherine Tucker.²⁰ Dr. Tucker’s Report opined that [REDACTED] [REDACTED],²¹ asserted that [REDACTED] [REDACTED],²² and posited that Dr. Williams’s injury and damages methodology was not tethered to conduct challenged by Advertiser Plaintiffs.²³

Professor Gans and Dr. Williams served reply reports on September 1 and 15, respectively.²⁴ Professor Gans’s reply opined that Dr. Tucker had asserted, but not shown, [REDACTED] [REDACTED], had not tied [REDACTED] to the presence of Facebook’s monopoly (or accounted for the absence of it in a but-for world), and noted that social data are typically subject to diminishing returns.²⁵ Dr. Williams’s reply explained that Dr. Tucker mischaracterized and largely ignored his market definition analysis,²⁶ and reiterated [REDACTED]

¹⁶ Williams Rpt. ¶¶ 217-83 (direct evidence), 284-322 (indirect evidence).

¹⁷ *Id.* ¶¶ 323-54.

¹⁸ *Id.* ¶ 336.

¹⁹ *Id.* ¶¶ 355-64.

²⁰ Ex. 3 (“Tucker Rpt.”).

²¹ Tucker Rpt. ¶¶ 21-51.

²² *Id.* ¶¶ 58-94.

²³ *Id.* ¶¶ 95-135.

²⁴ *See* Exs. 4 (“Gans Reply”), 5 (“Williams Reply”).

²⁵ Gans Reply ¶ 5-8.

²⁶ Williams Reply ¶¶ 34-60.

FILED UNDER SEAL

1 [REDACTED].²⁷ The Williams
2 Reply also responded to Dr. Tucker’s arguments regarding [REDACTED],²⁸ and alleged
3 variations in classwide injury and damages,²⁹ explaining that Dr. Tucker had failed to analyze the
4 presence or effect of monopoly power due to the challenged conduct—the centerpiece of Advertiser
5 Plaintiffs’ case and the cause of the price inflation in Facebook advertisements during the Class
6 Period—and that her other opinions were without evidentiary basis or simply wrong.

7 On September 26, Dr. Tucker sat for a deposition.³⁰

ARGUMENT

8
9 In order to admit expert testimony under Federal Rule of Evidence 702, “the proponent” must
10 “demonstrate[] that the expert is qualified and (a) the expert’s scientific, technical, or other specialized
11 knowledge will help the trier of fact to understand the evidence or to determine a fact in issue; (b) the
12 testimony is based on sufficient facts or data; (c) the testimony is the product of reliable principles
13 and methods; and (d) the expert has reliably applied the principle and methods to the facts of the
14 case.”³¹ As explained below, Dr. Tucker’s class certification opinions regarding the Advertiser case
15 do not meet this standard.

I. DR. TUCKER’S OPINIONS REGARDING FACEBOOK’S SALE OF SOCIAL ADVERTISING DURING THE CLASS PERIOD SHOULD BE EXCLUDED

16
17 A centerpiece of Dr. Tucker’s report is her assertion that [REDACTED]
18 [REDACTED] as defined by Dr. Williams and discussed by Professor
19 Gans.³² This opinion underpins not just Section III of Tucker’s report,³³ but paragraph 100 in Section
20

21 ²⁷ *Id.* ¶ 49.

22 ²⁸ *Id.* ¶¶ 65-83.

23 ²⁹ *Id.* ¶¶ 62-65, 84-133.

24 ³⁰ *See* Ex. 6 (“Tucker Dep.”).

25 ³¹ *Stiner v. Brookdale Senior Living, Inc.*, 2023 WL 2722294, at *5 (N.D. Cal. Mar. 20, 2023); *see*
26 FED. R. EVID. 702.

27 ³² Tucker Rpt. ¶¶ 21-51, 100, 104-06.

28 ³³ *Id.* ¶¶ 21-51 (“[REDACTED]”).

FILED UNDER SEAL

1 IV of her report as well. Dr. Tucker’s opinions regarding Facebook’s sale of Social Advertising during
2 the Class Period should be excluded as unreliable, as they fail to address Dr. Williams’s (or Professor
3 Gans’s) actual opinions regarding Social Advertising and lack any evidentiary or scientific basis
4 regarding the [REDACTED].

5 The Williams Report contains two hundred paragraphs, spanning eighty-eight pages, on the
6 “Relevant Antitrust Market.”³⁴ Dr. Williams defined the Social Advertising market by conducting a
7 full *Brown Shoe* analysis;³⁵ applying the Horizontal Merger Guidelines methodology, including by
8 conducting a SSNIP test;³⁶ and evaluating more than thirty distinct sources, including competition
9 authorities, industry analysts, and market participants to explain “[w]hat is social advertising,”
10 “[w]hat is not social advertising,” and to evaluate whether and to what extent Facebook’s advertising
11 products during the Class Period qualified as Social Advertising.³⁷ Dr. Williams explained that
12 “[s]ocial advertising is advertising that can be targeted based on social data contained in a ‘social
13 graph’” at the outset of his market definition analysis,³⁸ and Professor Gans understood the Social
14 Advertising market to “comprise[] suppliers of ad placement services with access to a social graph
15 that establishes direct connections between users,” which defines a “specific data advantage” for
16 providers.³⁹ (Professor Gans did not attempt to define the relevant market, but understood that “[t]he
17 analysis of the relevant market definition and Facebook’s position in it will . . . be provided in other
18 reports.”⁴⁰)

19 Dr. Tucker’s report ignored nearly every aspect of the above opinions, despite purporting to
20 rebut them. As Dr. Tucker admitted at deposition, her report did not address Dr. Williams’s Horizontal

21
22 ³⁴ Williams Rpt. ¶¶ 16-215.

23 ³⁵ *Id.* ¶¶ 144-211.

24 ³⁶ *Id.* ¶¶ 134-43.

25 ³⁷ *Id.* ¶¶ 16-126; *see* Williams Reply ¶ 48 & Table 1.

26 ³⁸ *Id.* ¶ 19.

27 ³⁹ Gans Rpt. ¶ 7, *see also id.* ¶ 13.

28 ⁴⁰ *Id.* ¶ 7.

FILED UNDER SEAL

1 Merger Guidelines analysis and SSNIP test.⁴¹ As to the *Brown Shoe* factors (Dr. Williams addressed
 2 all seven of them), Dr. Tucker admitted she did not “
 3 ⁴² but asserted that her report did impliedly address the first *Brown Shoe* factor, industry
 4 recognition of a submarket.⁴³ However, upon examination, Dr. Tucker admitted that she didn’t
 5 actually respond to—or perhaps even review—thirty different sources of industry recognition,
 6 including competition authorities, industry analysts, and market participants, analyzed by Dr.
 7 Williams in his opening report.⁴⁴ These sources supported Dr. Williams’s opinion—unequivocally
 8 expressed in his opening report and reaffirmed in his reply—that
 9 ⁴⁵

10 Similarly, Dr. Tucker’s report effectively ignored Dr. Williams’s explanation—concurred
 11 with by Professor Gans—that “[s]ocial advertising is advertising that can be targeted based on social
 12 data contained in a ‘social graph,’”⁴⁶ as well as the forty-five pages following it explaining
 13 ⁴⁷ who else sold or sells
 14 Social Advertising,⁴⁸ and what is not Social Advertising.⁴⁹ It is not clear how any rebuttal opinion
 15 that avowedly ignores essentially the entire opinion it purports to rebut could ever be reliable—let

16 ⁴¹ Tucker Dep. 12:21-25 (“
 17 ⁴² *Id.* 13:16-25.
 18 ⁴³ *Id.* 15:12-17.
 19 ⁴⁴ *Id.* 20:18-24 (“
 20
 21
 22
 23 ⁴⁵ Williams Reply ¶ 48 & Table 1; *see* Williams Rpt. ¶¶ 30-53.
 24 ⁴⁶ Williams Rpt. ¶ 19; *see* Gans Rpt. ¶¶ 7, 13.
 25 ⁴⁷ Williams Rpt. ¶¶ 22-53.
 26 ⁴⁸ *Id.* ¶¶ 54-68.
 27 ⁴⁹ *Id.* ¶¶ 69-126.
 28

FILED UNDER SEAL

1 alone helpful—but that is what Dr. Tucker did in Section III of her report, ignoring Dr. Williams’s
 2 and Professor Gans’s actual opinions to explain repeatedly that [REDACTED] a product not
 3 specifically discussed (or even named) by either Dr. Williams or Professor Gans, [REDACTED]

4 [REDACTED]⁵⁰

5 Put simply, Dr. Tucker’s analysis of [REDACTED]
 6 [REDACTED] ignored the market definition actually set forth by
 7 Plaintiffs’ expert Dr. Williams, used as the basis for his and Professor Gans’s injury and damages
 8 analyses. This makes her opinion unreliable and unhelpful, as [REDACTED]
 9 [REDACTED] is not an issue
 10 underpinning either Dr. Williams’ or Professor Gans’s analysis; is not an issue Advertiser Plaintiffs
 11 will seek to prove in this case; and accordingly is simply irrelevant to class certification analysis.

12 Moreover, Dr. Tucker’s deposition revealed a concerning lack of basic knowledge about the
 13 very ad systems and formats about which she purports to expertly opine. For example, Dr. Tucker
 14 opined (although this was not in her report), that a [REDACTED]

15 [REDACTED]
 16 [REDACTED].⁵¹ However, upon examination, Dr. Tucker revealed she was simply making this up
 17 on the fly based on her experience “[REDACTED]”.⁵² When pressed about
 18 the details of the [REDACTED]

19 [REDACTED], Tucker admitted [REDACTED],⁵³ and “[REDACTED]”
 20 [REDACTED].⁵⁴ On that subject, Dr. Tucker did not realize that

21 Plaintiffs *had* asked a Facebook engineer—and other witnesses, including Facebook’s Chief
 22 Marketing Officer Alex Schultz—[REDACTED]

23 ⁵⁰ See Tucker Rpt. ¶¶ 23, 31-33.

24 ⁵¹ Tucker Dep. 26:17-19.

25 ⁵² *Id.* 31:8-9; *see also id.* 36:23-37:1 (“[REDACTED]”).
 26 [REDACTED].”).

27 ⁵³ *Id.* 31:9-10

28 ⁵⁴ *Id.* 31:17-19

FILED UNDER SEAL

1 [REDACTED] and Dr. Tucker was simply wrong; [REDACTED]

2 [REDACTED]

3 [REDACTED].⁵⁵

4 Between Dr. Tucker's ignorance of Facebook's actual [REDACTED]
 5 [REDACTED] and her avowed refusal to analyze the actual Social Advertising definition put forth by
 6 Advertiser Plaintiffs' experts, her opinions regarding Facebook's sale of Social Advertising during
 7 the Class Period must be excluded as junk science. There is nothing reliable behind them, and they
 8 would be unhelpful to the Court. This impacts Section III of Dr. Tucker's report (paragraphs 21-51)
 9 as well as paragraph 100 in Dr. Tucker's Section IV.

10 **II. DR. TUCKER'S OPINIONS REGARDING THE IMPACT OF FACEBOOK'S**
 11 **ALLEGED CONDUCT SHOULD BE EXCLUDED BECAUSE THEY DO NOT**
 12 **ANALYZE THE PRESENCE OR ABSENCE OF MONOPOLY**

13 Sections IV and V of Dr. Tucker's report suffer from a glaring problem that warrants
 14 exclusion—Dr. Tucker never assesses the effects of Facebook's monopoly. To begin with, Dr. Tucker
 15 criticizes Professor Gans and Dr. Williams for failing to take into account [REDACTED]
 16 [REDACTED] resulting from the exclusionary acts undertaken by Facebook. Dr. Tucker, however,
 17 sidesteps the question actually at the heart of the Gans and Williams reports: What was the effect of
 18 Meta's unlawful monopoly on the class and the prices they paid? On that question, Dr. Tucker admits
 19 she has nothing to say, as she never even assessed the absence or presence of monopoly as part of her
 20 opinion on damages and injury. Without addressing that question, Dr. Tucker's report is not only
 21 beside the point on injury and damages, it is functionally without substance—at best, lawyers' argument cloaked in junk science.

22 Indeed, it is undisputed that Dr. Tucker never actually addressed what both Dr. Williams and
 23 Professor Gans analyzed. Dr. Williams directly addressed whether prices for Facebook's ads were
 24 inflated due to Facebook's monopoly, and Dr. Gans opined that Meta's exclusionary conduct, if

25

26 ⁵⁵ See, e.g., Ex. 7 (A. Schultz Dep.) 154:23-155:6 ([REDACTED])

27 [REDACTED]; *id.* 158:6-16 ([REDACTED])
 28 [REDACTED]; *id.* 159:3-5 [REDACTED].

FILED UNDER SEAL

1 proven, would have unlawfully maintained that monopoly and injured the class members. Both Dr.
 2 Williams and Dr. Gans were quite explicit about what they analyzed in their opening reports.⁵⁶⁵⁷ And
 3 there is no question that Dr. Tucker did not consider the absence or presence of monopoly—
 4 ⁵⁸ Dr. Williams and Professor Gans each noticed this glaring issue, and
 5 opined on it in their respective reply reports.⁵⁹

6 Not only did Dr. Tucker have nothing to say about the monopoly question, she does not
 7 dispute that Dr. Williams's injury and damages methodology is

8
 9
 10 ⁵⁶ See, e.g., Williams Rpt. ¶¶ 324 (“For damages purposes, I assess whether Facebook’s social
 11 advertising prices in the . . . Class Period were higher (or lower) than the social advertising prices that
 12 would have existed in the but-for world in the absence of the alleged conduct that maintained
 13 Facebook’s monopoly.”), 328 (“To estimate overcharges and damages, if any, I have assumed that
 14 the five categories of conduct that Plaintiffs contend helped Facebook maintain its monopoly in the
 15 U.S. social advertising market are true. However, even if certain of those categories of exclusionary
 conduct were not ultimately proven at trial, the methodology outlined below can still be used to show
 antitrust impact and damages on a classwide basis. That is, since the Class’s damages stem from
 Facebook’s monopoly maintenance—rather than any individual exclusionary act—if Facebook’s
 monopoly is judged unlawful, the damages methodology remains the same.”).

16 ⁵⁷ See, e.g., Gans Rpt. ¶¶ 14a (“Common evidence can be used to determine that the five categories
 17 of anticompetitive conduct identified above helped Facebook maintain its monopoly in the United
 18 States social advertising market, including by strengthening a Data Targeting Barrier to Entry.”); 14c
 19 (“I understand that Dr. Williams and Mr. Kreitzman show in their reports, to the extent Facebook
 unlawfully maintained its monopoly during the Class Period, all Class Members were harmed by
 Facebook’s conduct in the form of inflated advertising prices that could not have been charged absent
 Facebook’s monopoly.”).

20 ⁵⁸ Tucker Dep. 317:12-17 (“Q.
 21
 22
 23
 24
 25
 26
 27
 28
 29
 30
 31
 32
 33
 34
 35
 36
 37
 38
 39
 40
 41
 42
 43
 44
 45
 46
 47
 48
 49
 50
 51
 52
 53
 54
 55
 56
 57
 58
 59
 60
 61
 62
 63
 64
 65
 66
 67
 68
 69
 70
 71
 72
 73
 74
 75
 76
 77
 78
 79
 80
 81
 82
 83
 84
 85
 86
 87
 88
 89
 90
 91
 92
 93
 94
 95
 96
 97
 98
 99
 100
 101
 102
 103
 104
 105
 106
 107
 108
 109
 110
 111
 112
 113
 114
 115
 116
 117
 118
 119
 120
 121
 122
 123
 124
 125
 126
 127
 128
 129
 130
 131
 132
 133
 134
 135
 136
 137
 138
 139
 140
 141
 142
 143
 144
 145
 146
 147
 148
 149
 150
 151
 152
 153
 154
 155
 156
 157
 158
 159
 160
 161
 162
 163
 164
 165
 166
 167
 168
 169
 170
 171
 172
 173
 174
 175
 176
 177
 178
 179
 180
 181
 182
 183
 184
 185
 186
 187
 188
 189
 190
 191
 192
 193
 194
 195
 196
 197
 198
 199
 200
 201
 202
 203
 204
 205
 206
 207
 208
 209
 210
 211
 212
 213
 214
 215
 216
 217
 218
 219
 220
 221
 222
 223
 224
 225
 226
 227
 228
 229
 230
 231
 232
 233
 234
 235
 236
 237
 238
 239
 240
 241
 242
 243
 244
 245
 246
 247
 248
 249
 250
 251
 252
 253
 254
 255
 256
 257
 258
 259
 260
 261
 262
 263
 264
 265
 266
 267
 268
 269
 270
 271
 272
 273
 274
 275
 276
 277
 278
 279
 280
 281
 282
 283
 284
 285
 286
 287
 288
 289
 290
 291
 292
 293
 294
 295
 296
 297
 298
 299
 300
 301
 302
 303
 304
 305
 306
 307
 308
 309
 310
 311
 312
 313
 314
 315
 316
 317
 318
 319
 320
 321
 322
 323
 324
 325
 326
 327
 328
 329
 330
 331
 332
 333
 334
 335
 336
 337
 338
 339
 340
 341
 342
 343
 344
 345
 346
 347
 348
 349
 350
 351
 352
 353
 354
 355
 356
 357
 358
 359
 360
 361
 362
 363
 364
 365
 366
 367
 368
 369
 370
 371
 372
 373
 374
 375
 376
 377
 378
 379
 380
 381
 382
 383
 384
 385
 386
 387
 388
 389
 390
 391
 392
 393
 394
 395
 396
 397
 398
 399
 400
 401
 402
 403
 404
 405
 406
 407
 408
 409
 410
 411
 412
 413
 414
 415
 416
 417
 418
 419
 420
 421
 422
 423
 424
 425
 426
 427
 428
 429
 430
 431
 432
 433
 434
 435
 436
 437
 438
 439
 440
 441
 442
 443
 444
 445
 446
 447
 448
 449
 450
 451
 452
 453
 454
 455
 456
 457
 458
 459
 460
 461
 462
 463
 464
 465
 466
 467
 468
 469
 470
 471
 472
 473
 474
 475
 476
 477
 478
 479
 480
 481
 482
 483
 484
 485
 486
 487
 488
 489
 490
 491
 492
 493
 494
 495
 496
 497
 498
 499
 500
 501
 502
 503
 504
 505
 506
 507
 508
 509
 510
 511
 512
 513
 514
 515
 516
 517
 518
 519
 520
 521
 522
 523
 524
 525
 526
 527
 528
 529
 530
 531
 532
 533
 534
 535
 536
 537
 538
 539
 540
 541
 542
 543
 544
 545
 546
 547
 548
 549
 550
 551
 552
 553
 554
 555
 556
 557
 558
 559
 560
 561
 562
 563
 564
 565
 566
 567
 568
 569
 570
 571
 572
 573
 574
 575
 576
 577
 578
 579
 580
 581
 582
 583
 584
 585
 586
 587
 588
 589
 590
 591
 592
 593
 594
 595
 596
 597
 598
 599
 600
 601
 602
 603
 604
 605
 606
 607
 608
 609
 610
 611
 612
 613
 614
 615
 616
 617
 618
 619
 620
 621
 622
 623
 624
 625
 626
 627
 628
 629
 630
 631
 632
 633
 634
 635
 636
 637
 638
 639
 640
 641
 642
 643
 644
 645
 646
 647
 648
 649
 650
 651
 652
 653
 654
 655
 656
 657
 658
 659
 660
 661
 662
 663
 664
 665
 666
 667
 668
 669
 670
 671
 672
 673
 674
 675
 676
 677
 678
 679
 680
 681
 682
 683
 684
 685
 686
 687
 688
 689
 690
 691
 692
 693
 694
 695
 696
 697
 698
 699
 700
 701
 702
 703
 704
 705
 706
 707
 708
 709
 710
 711
 712
 713
 714
 715
 716
 717
 718
 719
 720
 721
 722
 723
 724
 725
 726
 727
 728
 729
 730
 731
 732
 733
 734
 735
 736
 737
 738
 739
 740
 741
 742
 743
 744
 745
 746
 747
 748
 749
 750
 751
 752
 753
 754
 755
 756
 757
 758
 759
 760
 761
 762
 763
 764
 765
 766
 767
 768
 769
 770
 771
 772
 773
 774
 775
 776
 777
 778
 779
 780
 781
 782
 783
 784
 785
 786
 787
 788
 789
 790
 791
 792
 793
 794
 795
 796
 797
 798
 799
 800
 801
 802
 803
 804
 805
 806
 807
 808
 809
 810
 811
 812
 813
 814
 815
 816
 817
 818
 819
 820
 821
 822
 823
 824
 825
 826
 827
 828
 829
 830
 831
 832
 833
 834
 835
 836
 837
 838
 839
 840
 841
 842
 843
 844
 845
 846
 847
 848
 849
 850
 851
 852
 853
 854
 855
 856
 857
 858
 859
 860
 861
 862
 863
 864
 865
 866
 867
 868
 869
 870
 871
 872
 873
 874
 875
 876
 877
 878
 879
 880
 881
 882
 883
 884
 885
 886
 887
 888
 889
 890
 891
 892
 893
 894
 895
 896
 897
 898
 899
 900
 901
 902
 903
 904
 905
 906
 907
 908
 909
 910
 911
 912
 913
 914
 915
 916
 917
 918
 919
 920
 921
 922
 923
 924
 925
 926
 927
 928
 929
 930
 931
 932
 933
 934
 935
 936
 937
 938
 939
 940
 941
 942
 943
 944
 945
 946
 947
 948
 949
 950
 951
 952
 953
 954
 955
 956
 957
 958
 959
 960
 961
 962
 963
 964
 965
 966
 967
 968
 969
 970
 971
 972
 973
 974
 975
 976
 977
 978
 979
 980
 981
 982
 983
 984
 985
 986
 987
 988
 989
 990
 991
 992
 993
 994
 995
 996
 997
 998
 999
 1000
 1001
 1002
 1003
 1004
 1005
 1006
 1007
 1008
 1009
 1010
 1011
 1012
 1013
 1014
 1015
 1016
 1017
 1018
 1019
 1020
 1021
 1022
 1023
 1024
 1025
 1026
 1027
 1028
 1029
 1030
 1031
 1032
 1033
 1034
 1035
 1036
 1037
 1038
 1039
 1040
 1041
 1042
 1043
 1044
 1045
 1046
 1047
 1048
 1049
 1050
 1051
 1052
 1053
 1054
 1055
 1056
 1057
 1058
 1059
 1060
 1061
 1062
 1063
 1064
 1065
 1066
 1067
 1068
 1069
 1070
 1071
 1072
 1073
 1074
 1075
 1076
 1077
 1078
 1079
 1080
 1081
 1082
 1083
 1084
 1085
 1086
 1087
 1088
 1089
 1090
 1091
 1092
 1093
 1094
 1095
 1096
 1097
 1098
 1099
 1100
 1101
 1102
 1103
 1104
 1105
 1106
 1107
 1108
 1109
 1110
 1111
 1112
 1113
 1114
 1115
 1116
 1117
 1118
 1119
 1120
 1121
 1122
 1123
 1124
 1125
 1126
 1127
 1128
 1129
 1130
 1131
 1132
 1133
 1134
 1135
 1136
 1137
 1138
 1139
 1140
 1141
 1142
 1143
 1144
 1145
 1146
 1147
 1148
 1149
 1150
 1151
 1152
 1153
 1154
 1155
 1156
 1157
 1158
 1159
 1160
 1161
 1162
 1163
 1164
 1165
 1166
 1167
 1168
 1169
 1170
 1171
 1172
 1173
 1174
 1175
 1176
 1177
 1178
 1179
 1180
 1181
 1182
 1183
 1184
 1185
 1186
 1187
 1188
 1189
 1190
 1191
 1192
 1193
 1194
 1195
 1196
 1197
 1198
 1199
 1200
 1201
 1202
 1203
 1204
 1205
 1206
 1207
 1208
 1209
 1210
 1211
 1212
 1213
 1214
 1215
 1216
 1217
 1218
 1219
 1220
 1221
 1222
 1223
 1224
 1225
 1226
 1227
 1228
 1229
 1230
 1231
 1232
 1233
 1234
 1235
 1236
 1237
 1238
 1239
 1240
 1241
 1242
 1243
 1244
 1245
 1246
 1247
 1248
 1249
 1250
 1251
 1252
 1253
 1254
 1255
 1256
 1257
 1258
 1259
 1260
 1261
 1262
 1263
 1264
 1265
 1266
 1267
 1268
 1269
 1270
 1271
 1272
 1273

FILED UNDER SEAL

1 [REDACTED]
2 [REDACTED]
3 None of this provides any substantive rebuttal to Professor Gans's or Dr. Williams's opinions,
4 and more problematically, none of Dr. Tucker's opinions on these issues pass muster as admissible
5 expert opinions at all. Put simply, Dr. Tucker did not address the question of monopoly in a
6 monopolization case, does not challenge the [REDACTED] of Dr. Williams's methodology on injury
7 and damages, and [REDACTED] Her
8 opinion is impertinent to the central questions of injury and damages before the Court on class
9 certification, and her report is devoid of the sort of scientific substance that distinguishes expert
10 testimony from additional briefing from Facebook's lawyers.

11 Sections IV and V of Dr. Tucker's report, comprising paragraphs 52-135, and any related
12 testimony, should be excluded on this distinct basis.

13 **III. DR. TUCKER'S OPINIONS REGARDING ALLEGED [REDACTED] FROM**
14 **FACEBOOK'S ANTICOMPETITIVE CONDUCT SHOULD BE EXCLUDED**

15 In Section IV of her report (paragraphs 52-94), and in several subparts of Section V
16 (paragraphs 104-06 and 111-20), Dr. Tucker opines that Facebook's alleged conduct would, if proven,
17 [REDACTED] and that Dr. Williams and Prof. Gans should have
18 accounted for [REDACTED] in their injury and damages analyses. However, here too, Dr. Tucker's
19 opinions are without reliable basis.

20 As an initial matter, as both Dr. Williams and Professor Gans point out in their respective
21 replies, Dr. Tucker's opinions regarding [REDACTED] are
22 methodologically unsound because they do not account for the presence or absence of monopoly.⁶⁴
23 That is, Dr. Tucker writes at length about how particular categories of anticompetitive behavior

24 ⁶² *Id.* 257:14-258:8 ([REDACTED]
25 [REDACTED]
26 [REDACTED].”).

27 ⁶³ *Id.* 258:2-8.

28 ⁶⁴ Williams Reply ¶¶ 72-79; Gans Reply ¶¶ 18-21, 29.

FILED UNDER SEAL

1 allegedly would—and, supposedly, did—⁶⁵
 2 yet her analysis simply looks at various categories of alleged conduct, posits
 3
 4 —with no analysis of monopoly power in the actual world, or
 5 the absence of that monopoly in the but-for world.⁶⁶ This is a problem for at least the reasons
 6 explained in the prior section—that Dr. Tucker simply doesn’t analyze the correct but-for world—
 7 but also because of the economic problems with Dr. Tucker’s approach to the actual world, as pointed
 8 out by Dr. Williams and Professor Gans in their respective replies.⁶⁷ Well-regarded economic theory
 9 holds that innovation and product improvement tend to diminish in the presence of monopoly, and
 10 the but-for world in this monopoly maintenance case *is one in which Facebook did not unlawfully*
 11 *maintain its monopoly during the Class Period.*

12 Dr. Tucker’s opinion on product improvement has an even more glaring problem: it’s factually
 13 baseless and in no way grounded in any sort of expertise. Dr. Tucker’s actual opinions about
 14 have all the hallmarks of junk science, pure paid *ipse dixit*. For example, in
 15 paragraphs 64-94 of her report, Dr. Tucker opines that various categories of allegedly anticompetitive
 16 conduct
 17 , with almost no evidentiary citations (outside of citations to Plaintiffs’ own experts).
 18 The apparent basis for Dr. Tucker to simply opine, with no serious evidence, about quality
 19 improvement in Facebook’s ads products in the but-for world is her self-proclaimed expertise: in
 20

21 ⁶⁵ Tucker Rpt. ¶¶ 52-94.

22 ⁶⁶ Tucker Dep. 250:4-19 (“Q
 23
 24
 25
 26
 27
 28
 ”).

26 ⁶⁷ See, e.g., Williams Reply ¶ 72 (“Dr. Tucker ignores the fact that competition rather than
 27 monopolization leads to more innovation and product improvement. . . . The economics literature
 28 shows that monopoly power has a negative effect on innovation.”); Gans Reply ¶ 18 (“A monopolist,
 in contrast to a competitive seller . . . has the ability to choose not to pass on any [increased]
 efficiencies.”).

FILED UNDER SEAL

1 addition to being an expert in the economics of advertising markets,⁶⁸ an expert in the economics of
 2 digital data and artificial intelligence,⁶⁹ an expert in economics,⁷⁰ an expert in the economics of
 3 privacy,⁷¹ and an expert in the economics of digital data, consumer behavior, and the monetization of
 4 platforms,⁷² Dr. Tucker is (according to her own testimony) also an “[REDACTED]
 5 [REDACTED].”⁷³ There appears little in which Dr. Tucker does not
 6 proclaim herself an expert.

7 None of that self-proclaimed expertise, however, is congruent with what Dr. Tucker actually
 8 knows about [REDACTED]. *See, e.g.*, Tucker Dep. 27:20-28 ([REDACTED]
 9 [REDACTED]
 10 [REDACTED]
 11 [REDACTED]); *id.* 31:18-19 ([REDACTED]
 12 [REDACTED]); *id.* 32:15-17 [REDACTED]
 13 [REDACTED]; *id.* 33:19-21 ([REDACTED]
 14 [REDACTED]); *id.* 36:23 ([REDACTED]
 15 [REDACTED]; *id.* 108:1-23 ([REDACTED]
 16 [REDACTED]
 17 [REDACTED]
 18 [REDACTED]
 19 [REDACTED]
 20 [REDACTED]
 21 [REDACTED]; *id.* 108:24-109:5

22
 23 ⁶⁸ Tucker Dep. 284:22-24.

24 ⁶⁹ *Id.* 284:25-285:3.

25 ⁷⁰ *Id.* 285:4-7.

26 ⁷¹ *Id.* 285:8-10.

27 ⁷² *Id.* 285:11-15.

28 ⁷³ *Id.* 285:16-287:1.

FILED UNDER SEAL

1 ([REDACTED]
2 [REDACTED]).
3 Dr. Tucker knows nothing of substance about [REDACTED]. She has
4 no understanding of [REDACTED]. She has no knowledge about [REDACTED]
5 [REDACTED]. It strains credulity that a person with so little technical
6 knowledge—and no apparent expertise—can competently testify about how [REDACTED]
7 [REDACTED]. With this in mind, it is perhaps unsurprising that Dr. Tucker’s
8 testimony about supposed [REDACTED] directly contradicts an empirical analysis
9 performed by Dr. Williams in his reply report.⁷⁴ This analysis, [REDACTED]
10 [REDACTED]
11 [REDACTED].⁷⁵ Dr. Tucker’s error shows that her opinion does
12 not scientifically explain the empirical facts—a hallmark of inadmissibility under the *Daubert*
13 standard. *Gen. Elec. Co. v. Joiner*, 522 U.S. 136, 146 (1997) (“nothing in either *Daubert* or the Federal
14 Rules of Evidence requires a district court to admit opinion evidence that is connected to existing data
15 only by the *ipse dixit* of the expert”).

16 Dr. Tucker offered no serious evidence of [REDACTED], did not know any technical
17 details about [REDACTED], and failed to
18 analyze the presence or absence of monopoly in the actual or but-for worlds. Her opinions regarding
19 alleged [REDACTED] are unreliable, unscientific, and inadmissible. The Court should exclude
20 paragraphs 52-94, 104-06, and 111-20 of the Tucker Report, and any related testimony, on this distinct
21 basis.

CONCLUSION

23 For the foregoing reasons, Advertiser Plaintiffs respectfully request that the Advertiser Class
24 Rebuttal Report of Catherine Tucker, as well as any related testimony, be excluded.

25
26
27 ⁷⁴ Williams Reply ¶¶ 80-83 & Fig. 2.

28 ⁷⁵ *Id.*

FILED UNDER SEAL

1 Dated: October 6, 2023

2 **BATHAE DUNNE LLP**

3 By: /s/ Yavar Bathae

4 Yavar Bathae (CA 282388)
yavar@bathaeedunne.com
5 Andrew C. Wolinsky (CA 345965)
awolinsky@bathaeedunne.com
6 Andrew M. Williamson (CA 344695)
awilliamson@bathaeedunne.com
7 Adam Ernette (*pro hac vice*)
aernette@bathaeedunne.com
8 Priscilla Ghiță (*pro hac vice*)
pghita@bathaeedunne.com
9 Chang Hahn (*pro hac vice*)
chahn@bathaeedunne.com
10 445 Park Avenue, 9th Floor
New York, NY 10022
11 Tel.: (332) 322-8835

12 Brian J. Dunne (CA 275689)
bdunne@bathaeedunne.com
13 Edward M. Grauman (*pro hac vice*)
egrauman@bathaeedunne.com
14 901 South MoPac Expressway
Barton Oaks Plaza I, Suite 300
15 Austin, TX 78746
Tel.: (213) 462-2772

16 Allison Watson Cross (CA 328596)
17 across@bathaeedunne.com
3420 Bristol St, Ste 600
18 Costa Mesa, CA 92626-7133

19 *Interim Co-Lead Counsel for the Advertiser Classes*

20 **LEVIN SEDRAN & BERMAN LLP**

21 Keith J. Verrier (*pro hac vice*)
kverrier@lfsblaw.com
22 Austin B. Cohen (*pro hac vice*)
23 acohen@lfsblaw.com
510 Walnut Street, Suite 500
24 Philadelphia, PA 19106-3997
Tel.: (215) 592-1500

25
26 *Members of Executive Committee for the Advertiser*
27 *Classes*
28

**SCOTT+SCOTT
ATTORNEYS AT LAW LLP**

By: /s/ Amanda F. Lawrence

Amanda F. Lawrence (*pro hac vice*)
alawrence@scott-scott.com
Patrick J. McGahan (*pro hac vice*)
pmcgahan@scott-scott.com
Michael P. Srodoski (*pro hac vice*)
msrodoski@scott-scott.com
156 South Main Street, P.O. Box 192
Colchester, CT 06415
Tel.: (860) 537-5537

Patrick J. Coughlin (CA 111070)
pcoughlin@scott-scott.com
Carmen A. Medici
cmedici@scott-scott.com
Hal D. Cunningham (CA 243048)
hcunningham@scott-scott.com
Daniel J. Brockwell (CA 335983)
dbrockwell@scott-scott.com
600 W. Broadway, Suite 3300
San Diego, CA 92101
Tel.: (619) 233-4565

Patrick J. Rodriguez (*pro hac vice*)
prodriguez@scott-scott.com
230 Park Avenue, 17th Floor
New York, NY 10169
Tel.: (212) 223-6444

AHDOOT & WOLFSON, PC

Tina Wolfson (CA 174806)
twolfson@ahdootwolfson.com
Robert Ahdoot (CA 172098)
rahdoot@ahdootwolfson.com
Theodore W. Maya (CA 223242)
tmaya@ahdootwolfson.com
Henry J. Kelson (*pro hac vice*)
hkelston@ahdootwolfson.com
2600 West Olive Avenue, Suite 500
Burbank, CA 91505
Tel.: (310) 474-9111

FILED UNDER SEAL

FILER ATTESTATION

I am the ECF user who is filing this document. Pursuant to Civil L.R. 5-1(h)(3), I hereby attest that each of the other signatories have concurred in the filing of the document.

Dated: October 6, 2023

By: /s/ Brian J. Dunne